

Stratton, Jon (2000) Not Just Another Multicultural Story: The English, From 'Fitting In' to Self-Ethnicisation, *Journal of Australian Studies* (66):23-47,-251-255.

## NOT JUST ANOTHER MULTICULTURAL STORY

**Pommy:** *Colloq.* 1. an Englishman. –adj. 2. English. Also,  
**pom.** [abbrev. of POMEGRANATE, rhyming slang for  
immigrant]

The Macquarie Dictionary, Second ed. 1985

### I

#### English Migrants and the Ideology of 'Fitting In' to Australia

It would be usual, these days, to argue that the experience of British migrants in Australia is the norm against which the reception of non-British migrants has always been articulated. I will argue that the understanding of how British migrants were expected to experience Australia, and were, and are, experienced by Australians has been ideologically driven, at first, by a need to see the Australian society, and the culture that evolved, as a version of British society and culture and, later, during the era of official multiculturalism, by the desire to assert this culture as the naturalised, core culture of Australia. John Docker writes that the emphasis on Anglo-conformity, which laid the basis for the present-day core culture, became pervasive in the period between the two world wars.<sup>1</sup> Since this period also, and corresponding to the emphasis on Anglo-conformity, there has developed an assumption that migrants from the United Kingdom and Ireland, and, indeed, all English-speaking migrants, would simply 'fit in' to Australian society. By 'fitting in' I do not mean that they would assimilate, assimilation in its classical definition entails the expectation that the person's behaviour and ideas would change to be more congruent with those of the host country.<sup>2</sup> Rather, I mean that there was the assumption, no matter how obviously it was contradicted by actual experiences, that English-speaking migrants would simply merge with the general population.<sup>3</sup> I will argue that such an assumption has continued during the era of official multiculturalism.

As many writers have argued, the organization of official multiculturalism has determined that non-English-speaking migrants should be constructed as members of 'ethnic groups.'<sup>4</sup> This ethnicisation has been more or less involuntary in the sense that the structure of official multiculturalism has determined that the interests of non-English-speaking

migrants are best served by the formation of such groups. The ethnicisation of migrants from Britain has a very different origin. Rather than being imposed on them, British migrants and their descendents are engaged in a process of self-ethnicisation as a consequence of a number of forces, perhaps the most important being the movement of the Hawke/Keating Labor government in the 1980s and 1990s away from the acceptance that British migrants should have a privileged place in Australian society, and the attempt to shift the thinking about Australia itself from the idea that it is some sort of offshoot of British society in the southern Pacific to seeing Australia as being, and always having been, engaged in, and to some extent moulded by, the South Asian region. One strand of the gradual self-ethnicisation of British migrants is their attempt to assert that British society/culture is not the same as Australian society/culture, and that they should be treated like other migrant groups to Australia. Politically speaking, British self-ethnicisation has to do with people who identify as being of British background feeling that they have lost a status, and an entitlement, that was naturally theirs. Self-ethnicisation is an attempt to gain a new status, this time one that places British-Australians on an equivalence with other ethnic groups in Australia. While many people, including, for example, John Howard, the Prime Minister, and Pauline Hanson, the right-wing, populist leader of the One Nation party, still want to assert a core culture that is claimed to have its roots in Britain and Ireland, and the organizational form of official multiculturalism encourages this, increasing numbers of British migrants are arguing for the same rights and treatment accorded non-English-speaking migrants by asserting their own ethnic backgrounds. As I will explain, such a development will have the unintended effect of highlighting important contradictions in the organization of multiculturalism.

Multiculturalism was introduced into Australia as official government policy first in Al Grassby's speech in 1974, 'A Multi-Cultural Society for the Future.' At the time, Grassby was Minister for Immigration in Gough Whitlam's Labor government. Subsequently, the Liberal prime minister, Malcolm Fraser, formalised the policy when he put in place most of the major recommendations of the so-called Galbally Report, the *Report on the Review of Post-Arrival Programs and Services to Migrants*, which was delivered to the government in 1978. The concern of this report was with non-English Speaking Background Migrants (N.E.S.B.s as they became known), not English-speaking migrants, and the effect of the organising principle of the policy was to construct a formal organization of Australian culture which distinguished between a core and a periphery.<sup>5</sup> The core culture was that which was considered to exist already in Australia, what had been formed through the pressures of

Anglo-conformity, and which, mythically though, was thought to have 'always' existed. The periphery cultures were those of the European and Levantine migrant groups who had been allowed into Australia from the time of Arthur Calwell's broadening of the White Australia policy in the period following the end of the Second World War.

As I have already suggested, the most important classificatory device for identifying the migrants with special needs, the ones who give meaning to the term multicultural, was their inability to speak English. Since the time of the establishment of official multiculturalism, English-speaking migrants have formed an anomalous category. This is reflected in the series of Community Profile pamphlets put out by the Bureau of Immigration Research based on the 1991 official census. Here, among pamphlets devoted to migrants from a wide variety of countries, including the United Kingdom, is one on 'English-speaking born' which includes migrants from the United States, Ireland, New Zealand, Canada and South Africa, as well as the United Kingdom.<sup>6</sup> What is the significance of this? English-speaking migrants can be grouped together because English is the core language of Australia. Although Australia has no language act making English the official language of the country, English is, as it has been since colonisation, the language of government and the language of public everyday life. The ideological importance of English in Australia is closely associated with the role of English in Britain as a successful colonising language in Wales, Scotland, Ireland and Cornwall. English is associated with Australia's Anglo-British heritage and also, as Australia's core language, is fundamentally important to the expression and reproduction of what is identified as Australia's core culture—that which, since the early 1980s, has become known as Anglo-Celtic culture.

Anglo-Celtic has come to be used to describe what has been constructed as the core Australian culture. Explicit in the term is the assumption that Australian culture derives from Britain and Ireland by way of migrants from these places. Implicit is the claim that the populations of these countries are made up of descendents of Anglo-Saxons and Celts. As we shall see, this is, itself, a very ideologically loaded claim. One problem with the use of Anglo-Celtic is that it refers to a group which, for it to stay successfully naturalised as hegemonic in the Australian cultural order, ought to have remained exnominated. Thus, the discursive identification of Anglo-Celts and Anglo-Celtic culture as 'Australian' culture, 'real Australians' and 'real Australian culture' as these terms are sometimes used as synonyms, already marks a disturbance in the category of the naturalised Australian core culture, and suggests a certain anxiety among the people who compose it.

Going along with this disturbance is a problem with the use of the term 'ethnicity'. In *Race Daze* I argued that ethnicity entered the governmental lexicon in Australia at the same time that multiculturalism did,<sup>7</sup> and that it came to be used in official multicultural-speak as a way of distinguishing different cultural groupings within the racial category defined as 'white'. In fact, more generally, ethnicity is a term used to discriminate culturally diverse groups within any 'race'. However, since white was a naturalised category in Australia until the late 1970s when the effects of the ending of the White Australia policy began to be noticed, ethnicity and its cognates have become the key distinguishing marker.

In Australia, ethnicity is closely aligned with migration and so, in virtually all cases, ethnicity, used as a marker of cultural difference, is classified by national origin. However, in Australia not every migrant, and not everybody from a migrant background, is thought of as an ethnic, that is someone to whom ethnicity is attributed. Here, we come back to the 'English-Speaking Born' Community Profile pamphlet. Those migrants who come from English-speaking countries, and who are themselves first-language English speakers, and those Australians descended from such migrants, do not tend to get identified ethnically.

We can be more precise about this. The category 'English-speaking born' does not designate an ethnic group nor, as importantly, are those from the countries identified, the migrants from which make up the category of English-speaking born, usually ethnicised. For example, Americans in Australia do not tend to be thought of, either officially or in day-to-day multicultural thinking, as ethnics, or as members of an ethnic group, nor for that matter are Canadians or South Africans. Why not? The answer to this is complicated. First of all we must acknowledge that the general assumption is that those people from English-speaking backgrounds will be white. This is in spite of the fact that, for example, the most visible Americans in Australia are African-American basketball players. The reason for the assumption lies in the connection between English-speaking, whiteness, and the migration of people from Britain to those colonies which, with the exception of the United States, came to form the settler-countries of the British Empire. Thus, we are not here really talking about whiteness as such but rather a category within whiteness which gained its political valence as part of the racial preoccupations of the nineteenth century, Anglo-Saxon. I will discuss this history in more detail below because it is an essential contribution to understanding the vexed situation of English migrants in Australia today.

While Anglo-Saxon, with its associations of British heritage, forms the connotative heart of 'English-speaking born', whiteness works as a penumbra allowing the expected inclusion of all white Americans, of Afrikaner as well as British-background South Africans, and French-Canadians among others. In these last two cases the language qualification is rather more complicated and secondary to the imperial reference. What gives stability of meaning to the category 'English-speaking born', then, is the historical importance of Britain as the preferred source of migrants to Australia. And, in connection with the organization of official multiculturalism, it is crucial to appreciate that the British have not been ethnicised either as 'British' or as members of the constituent parts of the United Kingdom. Moreover, following a lengthy history in Australia in which difference between Australian and British, and especially English, culture has been denied, asserting English ethnicity remains complicated and problematic.

### **The Problem of Naming**

Before I go any further, we need to pause here to consider the very practical problem of terminology, a problem which lends its own confusion to both the development of, and the understanding of the development of, British or English ethnicisation in Australia. Technically, the United Kingdom came into existence through the Act of Union which incorporated Scotland and England into a single governmental entity in 1707. Wales had been linked with England much earlier in 1536. A further Act of Union, which came into effect on January 1<sup>st</sup>, 1801, incorporated Ireland into the United Kingdom where it remained until the signing of a treaty in 1921 that ended the Anglo-Irish War and created the Irish Free State while partitioning the island. The Union officially ended when the Irish Provisional Government ratified the treaty on January 15<sup>th</sup>, 1922. The United Kingdom now consists of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. On May 29<sup>th</sup>, 1953, a proclamation made Elizabeth II queen of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, which is how the United Kingdom is described on British passports. Thus, Great Britain includes what were historically three countries of the main island of the British Isles: England, Scotland, Wales. As is well-known, the history of England's relationship with Wales and Scotland, and for that matter Cornwall and the Channel Islands, as well as with Ireland, has been one of a long drawn-out process of colonisation. This process only started to be significantly reversed in Wales and Scotland during the 1980s and 1990s.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, we should not forget that the status of Northern Ireland continues to be violently disputed.

As Geoffrey Partington notes, Britishness was recent in origin.<sup>9</sup> It was still evolving, along with the substitution of English for the other languages in the British Isles, over the period that Australia was colonised. Also we should remember in passing that, for much of modern Australian history, Irish migrants came to Australia as British subjects. Partington makes the further point that:

‘A shared sense of Britishness was often achieved more readily in the Australian colonies than back home, partly because of the sharp contrast with the Aborigines, partly because the different populations of the British Isles were mixed together as they never had been before even in Britain’s American colonies.’<sup>10</sup>

Because of, and indeed as an aspect of, England’s colonising practice, the adjective ‘British’ has tended to be synonymous with English while including Welsh, Scottish and sometimes Irish. In Australia, as in Britain, there has tended to be a conflation of British and English with the consequent elision of Welsh, Scottish and even Irish cultural, and of course, political, distinctiveness.

With the gradual assertion of ethnicities from the United Kingdom has come the associated problem of what ethnicity is being put forward. With Ireland now an independent country, the development of Irish ethnicity could work fairly straightforwardly as one more ethnicity identified by national origin—were it not that the Irish, as English-speakers, are incorporated into the core culture. However, whether there is such an ethnicity as ‘British’ and how such an ethnic claim might function vis-à-vis claims to Welsh and Scottish ethnicities, or indeed whether is possible to think of a Northern Irish ethnicity, are important problems that all bear on any alternate claim to an ‘English’ ethnicity.<sup>11</sup>

The complications are readily apparent. For example, Sydney, and now Melbourne, are holding annual BritFests which include cultural items not only from England but also from Scotland, Wales and Ireland. To quote from an article on the United Kingdom Settlers’ Association homepage about the Melbourne BritFest 2000, held on February 28th in Frankston:

‘Live entertainment representing Australia’s heritage in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales, both traditional and modern, was featured. This includes music, food, drink, costume, modern science and technology, and our hallowed British folkways.’<sup>12</sup>

The problem here is that if Britishness is not simply the result of the merging of the different national cultures that go, or have gone in the past, to make up the United Kingdom—this is the image of Britain as a kind of ‘melting pot’ and would seem to be Partington’s definition—then it must carry an English colonising connotation. In celebrating Australia’s heritage in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales, BritFest has already gone a remarkable way towards deconstructing what it wants to promote, ‘British folkways’. Unless, that is, British is to be understood in a federal, rather than a synthesising sense. The obvious problem caused by the desire to include Ireland exemplifies well the issues of power and of cultural recolonisation under the apparently benign intention of ethnic formation.

Because of the ambiguities I have outlined, terminology even within this article is problematic. At times when it is clear that English ethnicity is being identified, as opposed to Irish, Welsh or Scottish, I have used the term English. When a more general, United Kingdom, ethnicity is being suggested, with the Irish specified either in or out, I have used the term British. On those occasions when there is a slippery merging of the connotations of British and English I have used the awkward neologism Brit/Eng.

### **Anglo-Saxonism and the English**

Robert Menzies, United Australia prime minister from 1939-1941 and Liberal prime minister from 1949-66, claimed that Australians, like the British, are Anglo-Saxons. In 1935, distinguishing Australians from Americans, he asserted that ‘We err if we regard the Americans as our blood cousins. The majority are not Anglo-Saxons.’<sup>13</sup> He was, most likely, thinking of the large migration of Yiddish-background Jews and southern Europeans to the United States in the early years of the twentieth century. The rhetoric of an Anglo-Saxon race of which Australians were an offshoot from the main, British trunk had been important in the establishment of a consensual identity among the Australian colonies both before and after federation. Sir Henry Parkes, in 1879, argued that ‘we are all one people’ and that this unity could be traced to its British source. He went on to write that there were,

‘no discordant elements amongst Australians, no incompatibilities of race, no divergent influences in the physical conditions of Australian life. All were one people whose destiny was the building up of a free nation of British stamp and character.’<sup>14</sup>

The identification with Britain, most often expressed in the idea of a common Anglo-Saxon race, became both a way of unifying Australians and asserting a common heritage in a British

origin.<sup>15</sup> After federation the rhetoric, transformed into the White Australia policy, became the way of realising what had not previously been the case

Arguments for a white, British Australia began to be put forward in the mid-nineteenth century. By the time of the first federal census in 1911, 1.17% of the population was still classified as of non-European races, either full-blood or half-caste. This figure excludes those defined as full-blood Aborigines.<sup>16</sup> In the 1947 and 1954 censuses, the percentage had declined to 0.72.

In the mid-nineteenth century Anglo-Saxon was becoming a racial term. Previous to this, its use in Britain had been political, to identify the society that had existed in the country before the Norman invasion. As Christopher Hill puts it:

‘The theory of the Norman Yoke, as we find it from the seventeenth century onwards, took many forms; but in its main outlines it ran as follows: Before 1066 the Anglo-Saxon inhabitants of the country lived as free and equal citizens, governing themselves through representative institutions. The Norman Conquest deprived them of this liberty, and established the tyranny of an alien king and landlords.’<sup>17</sup>

This construction of a free, pre-invasion Anglo-Saxon people became a central plank in post-seventeenth century radical English thought. However, by the mid-eighteenth century the appeal to the past was replaced in Tom Paine’s *Common Sense* (1776) and *The Rights of Man* (1791) by the more philosophical and abstract claim to the rights of the individual, founded on reason. Anglo-Saxonism ceased to be used for radical purposes. Hill writes that:

‘Only when Saxon freedom had ceased to be a rallying cry for the discontented masses did it begin to be enthusiastically taught in the lecture-rooms of Oxford. And ultimately, in the racial form which was rarely hinted at by the earlier revolutionaries, but on which nineteenth-century historians laid more stress, the conception of a unique Germanic and Anglo-Saxon heritage of freedom could be perverted to justify German or Anglo-Saxon world domination.’<sup>18</sup>

The racialisation of Anglo-Saxon was an effect of its new, conservative use as providing an origin for the English nation. The indeterminate meanings of English and British allows for



the ideology of the Anglo-Saxon race to be attached to Britain and to be used alternately with the idea of a British race.

The rhetoric of an Anglo-Saxon racial origin was not confined to England and Australia. In the United States:

‘By the 1840s, many Americans, prompted by current European thought and by their own experience with slaves, American Indians, Mexicans, and certain groups of European immigrants, conceived of the Anglo-Saxon race itself as superior and of themselves as derived from that race and possessing a mission to bring to the rest of the world the fruits of what they understood to originate among the Anglo-Saxons.’<sup>19</sup>

Here we can see how claims to a racialised Anglo-Saxon origin could enable diverse groups of English-speaking people to claim a common heritage.

At this point we may seem to be a long way from the ethnicisation of the English in Australia. However, the constant claim to the Anglo-Saxon nature of Australians has provided a crucial backdrop to the way British migrants have been received in Australia up until the 1980s, and, therefore, to their reaction today and, in addition, to how Brit/Eng ethnicity is being constructed, and attitudes to it from the broader Australian population.

Peter Cochrane, in his important article on Anglo-Saxonness in Australia notes that:

‘The idea of an Anglo-Saxon Australia was powerful and persistent. Writers as diverse in time and orientation as C.E.W. Bean and Craig McGregor, W.K. Hancock and Miriam Dixon, J.D. Pringle and Dennis Altman, have described Australia factually, as an ‘Anglo-Saxon’ society or country.’<sup>20</sup>

Cochrane goes on to note the increasing desuetude of the term:

‘And then it was gone: somewhere between the 1950s and the 1980s the Anglo-Saxon idea surrendered its hegemony. With new patterns of immigration, ethnic diversity and eventually multiculturalism, the term lost its affirmative meanings and took on negative connotations.’<sup>21</sup>

Perhaps most importantly, what happened was the shift away from the legitimacy of essentialist views on race in the political and cultural public sphere. ‘Anglo-Celtic’ as a way of describing British and Irish cultural heritage took over from the idea of an Anglo-Saxon race. However, Anglo-Celtic describes membership of the core culture in multiculturalism

and cannot be used as an ethnic marker. Indeed, politically, if Anglo-Celtic were to become a signifier of ethnicity it would peripheralise the core. Thus, it is important to acknowledge that Anglo-Celtic has a very different status to the deployment of Brit/Eng terms which *are* markers of ethnicity.

While the terminology of Anglo-Saxonism has more or less disappeared in Australia since the 1970s, replaced by that of Anglo-Celtic, the discursive echoes continue.<sup>22</sup> Thus, for example, Partington in *The Australian Nation*, wanting to emphasise what he sees as having been the positive effects of British settlement in Australia, subheads his first chapter 'The tradition of English freedom'. While he is writing about England in the eighteenth century, the subtextual allusion is to Anglo-Saxon England before the Norman Yoke.

In a later article published in *The Adelaide Review* in April 1999, Partington tells the story of an Adelaide city councillor, Alfred Huang, who 'made it clear that he intended to exclude persons he described an 'Anglo-Saxon''<sup>23</sup> from eligibility for the city's grants and sponsorships. As well as wanting to highlight an example of discrimination, Partington points out that:

'Just what Councillor Huang meant by 'Anglo-Saxon' is obscure: it might mean persons born in England, all Australians of English origin, or anything in between.'<sup>24</sup>

Huang's usage buys into the older, racial version of the myth of the Australian nation, the version endorsed by the White Australia policy and by assimilation. In this article Partington distinguishes himself from such rhetoric, instead pushing the ethnic rights of 'people of English or British descent' and announcing himself as the South Australian President of TEA, The English in Australia.

An indication of the discursive overlap between the rhetoric of Anglo-Celtic and that of Anglo-Saxon can be found by going to the webpage called 'Proud to be British Australians!' Here, the language is that of ethnicity and multiculturalism:

'This is an independent site for Australians who are proud of their ancestral origins in the British Isles. In modern multicultural Australia, it is okay to take pride in your ethnic heritage. Australians of Anglo-Celtic background have a lot to be proud of and should not feel pressured into feeling that they should take second place to any other ethnic group.'<sup>25</sup>

There is, in this article, a certain understandable anxiety about asserting the rights of Brit/Eng ethnicity. The use of Anglo-Celtic, in the context of claiming ethnic rights, brings to the fore the problematic meaning of the term. Not least because of the problem of what 'Anglo-Celtic background' might mean. At the same time one of the 'Great Links' identified on the site takes you to 'The Celts and Saxons Homepage'. This is, I should add, a very respectable site, full of worthy information. However, once again, we have a discursive echo. British Australians, it would seem, are not just people who have migrated to Australia from Britain. Nor do they include people of Norman background. They have an Anglo-Saxon, and Celtic, origin. This would exclude not only those of French descent but also, for example, the Jews who migrated to Britain from the Pale around the turn of the twentieth century, as well the West Indians and South Asians who migrated there in the 1950s and 1960s.

Douglas Cole identified Anglo-Saxonism as the second within three tiers of ethnocentric thinking in Australia. At its broadest there was the idea of whiteness which blurred into the second tier, the more specific idea of a British or Anglo-Saxon race:

'[The] broad ethnocentric feeling of white kinship, solidarity, and struggle blended with a consciousness of British kind, narrower in its scope, but part of a pattern of ethnocentric ideas. The British or Anglo-Saxon consciousness expressed itself in an emphasis upon the grandeur of British civilisation and the similarity and solidarity of the Anglo-Saxon.'<sup>26</sup>

Cole argued that this second tier blurred, in its turn, into the idea of a developing Australian race. With the movement away from essentialist racial ideology since around the Second World War the idea of a specific Australian race has fallen by the wayside. Since that race was supposed to be an inflection of white Anglo-Saxon peoples its loss helped the shift away from the White Australia policy. However, it needs to be remembered that, in some far right-wing areas of politics, and in the population generally, the ideology of a white Australia remains a potent force.

For example, National Action, generally considered to be a far-right minority political party, describes itself on its webpage as 'a Nationalist political movement. It was founded in 1982 to promote the cause of Australian Independence (*sic*), national identity and social justice'.<sup>27</sup> This radical Australian nationalism is fundamentally linked to the claim of a white Australia:

'We aim to preserve and promote this European Nation in the Southern Land. We look to no-one but ourselves to achieve this: only the ideal of a true independence will be accepted in this very real struggle for national freedom, and so Nationalists reject the fraud of Westminsterism and constitutional links to Britain and its royal family, which is committed to internationalism—we fly the Eureka flag, the symbol of an Independent White Australia.'<sup>28</sup>

A major problem for those people attempting to assert Brit/Eng ethnicity is that any positive claims about the British/English people, and their role in Australia's modern settlement can be heard as nationalist claims for the primacy of an Anglo-Celtic heritage in Australia which in turn, easily slips into a reassertion of the racial superiority of Anglo-Saxon Australia. This, ultimately, works in the broadest context of Australia's long history of the White Australia policy which promoted and privileged the ideology of a white race which for members of groups such as National Action, is by no means defunct.

### **Australians as Transplanted Britons**

From the period between the two world wars, as Anglo-conformity was being enforced on the population, a myth gradually came to be accepted in Australia as common sense history that the continent had been settled by people from Britain, mostly from England, with a noticeable Irish contribution. The consequence of this, so the myth goes, is that Britons, and especially the English, will find Australian society to be fundamentally the same as British society and Australia will be experienced as a sunnier, happier, home from home. Australian literature promoting migration tended to reinforce this idea. For example, in 1922 *Australia Invites the Domestic Girl* asserted that:

'Australia, spacious sunny home of the sturdy, hearty Digger, is renewing her invitation to the people of the old land to come out and help her realise her proud future as the Britain of the southern seas.'<sup>29</sup>

In his 1959 book, *Australian Accent*, John Douglas Pringle has this to say from the British point of view:

Most Englishmen who go to Australia expect to find it a replica of England. They know, of course, that the climate and scenery will be different. . . . But they are still convinced in their hearts that when they get there they will find a new, sunnier and more spacious England into which they will fit quite easily

and with only a brief period of adjustment. After all, are not ninety per cent of Australians of British descent, minnows scooped from a little pond and dropped into a big one?'<sup>30</sup>

Pringle's description shows the remarkable congruence between the image of Australia that Australia was promoting and that current in Britain.<sup>31</sup>

After the Second World War, the British and Australian governments worked out a plan for the Assisted Passage Scheme. This began in 1947 and was finally discontinued in 1982.<sup>32</sup> During this period 1,137,587 British migrants took advantage of the offer.<sup>33</sup> Almost half that number again travelled unassisted.<sup>34</sup> When the migrants arrived large numbers were put up in hostels along with migrants from other countries. In one woman's reminiscence:

'After all we'd been told about this wonderful new country at Australia House, we couldn't believe it when we arrived to find this concentration camp.'<sup>35</sup>

Betka Zamoyska, in *The Ten Pound Fare*, notes how,

'Many of the new arrivals expected that jobs were going to be automatically provided for them and they were surprised to discover that they had to go and find one (usually by looking through the advertisements in local papers).'<sup>36</sup>

Here we can see well the effects of the Australian determination to view Australian society as fundamentally Brit/English. It was expected that British migrants would just 'fit in', needing no special care.

In the post-war era when the concern was to get migrants to assimilate to the Australian way of life, British migrants were not thought of in terms of assimilation because it was presumed that only people from other cultures would have to go through the process of adaptation and adjustment. At the first Citizenship Convention, held in Canberra in 1950, Harold Holt, the Minister for Immigration, asserted that: 'This is a British community, and we want to keep it a British community living under British standards and by the methods and ideals of British Parliamentary democracy.'<sup>37</sup> In his 1994 book, which is itself a contribution to the growing sense of a Brit/Eng ethnic identity in Australia, Partington takes up this ideology and uses it to explain the Anglo nature of nineteenth century Australian society. He writes that:

'The English were the predominant group numerically among the Australian colonists and their ideas and customs gave the new Australia its chief characteristics. . . . Yet the English majority dissolved into unhyphenated Australians even more quickly than the minorities.'<sup>38</sup>

Here, we have a historical justification for the claimed Englishness of Australian culture. We also have a description, set back in the past, of how Australians, and for that matter the British migrants themselves, wished to think the British migrants of the post-Second World War period had entered Australian society.

In an article published in *Nation* in 1963 Geoffrey Dutton wrote that:

'We are largely to blame for the difficulties English migrants encounter in Australia. We tell them we are no different (we can compare bootsoles) and, of course, they speedily find out that we are very different, and they are disappointed.'<sup>39</sup>

This ideological claim to the sameness of British and Australian cultures reached its apogee in Menzies' statement, made in 1948, that, 'the boundaries of Great Britain are not on the Kentish coast, but at Cape York and Invercargill.'<sup>40</sup>

### **Post-War Attitudes towards the English**

In his article, 'Anglo-Celtics Today', Ghassan Hage argues that during the period after the Second World War a change took place in Australian attitudes to Britain which was coupled with, and utilised, the newly developing sense of Australian national consciousness. Hage explains that where previously there had been an attempt by the Australian elite to identify with, and be accepted by, the British upper-class, there developed

'the current, well-known to contemporary Australians and based on the elevation to the status of national capital by the local middle class and intellectuals, of representations of an 'Australian', partly working-class, partly Irish, encounter with the 'Australian' natural environment.'<sup>41</sup>

He goes on to argue that:

'It is misleading to see this new current simply in terms of an Australianness in opposition to Britishness. It is mainly in opposition to upper-class Britishness rather than Britishness as such that the newly elevated Australian-

specific national capital was deployed. . . . the new national capital was clearly the product of a frustration with the constant inability to accumulate British upper-class capital as far as Australians were concerned, and a strategy aiming at valorising a different capital.'<sup>42</sup>

Hage is right to locate a transformation in attitude to Britishness and, I want to add, to the British, in the decades following the Second World War. However, I do not believe that the change, and for that matter the development of a sense of 'Australian-specific national capital', can solely be explained by Australian disappointment in their attempts at acceptance into elite British culture. More important, I suggest, was the development of a sense of British and Irish racial/cultural heritage during this period in the face of the governmental widening of the category of white in order rapidly to increase the size of the Australian population by allowing in refugees and migrants from Eastern and Southern Europe, and the Levant.

Arthur Calwell, who was the chief architect of the new migration policy, had originally stated that, 'for every foreign migrant there will be ten people from the United Kingdom.'<sup>43</sup> However, even by the time of the Report of the Commonwealth Immigration Advisory Committee, it was clear that, even with the use of the Assisted Passage scheme to encourage British migrants: 'half Australia's immigrants now are drawn from the continent of Europe.'<sup>44</sup> In a country that, since before federation, had constructed a foundation myth of itself as not only white but Anglo-Saxon with the Irish providing a Celtic compliment (with Welsh and Scots here tending to get subsumed under the English as British and therefore Anglo-Saxon), such a development was a profoundly unwelcome shock.

Along with the growing perception of a distinctive, but British/Anglo-Saxon originated, Australian culture, there developed a contradictory attitude to British culture, and to British migrants. On the one hand British migrants were expected to add to the established Australian stock, after all, as the Calwell quotation amply demonstrates, they were not considered to be 'foreign' like the new white migrants. On the other hand, there was also a sense of the inferiority of British migrants, identified as pommies<sup>45</sup>, as compared to this Australian stock, and of British culture as compared to Australian culture. The antagonism to what was perceived as pommy weakness is well illustrated in a scene in the novel *The New Australians* by Allan Aldous published in 1956. This book, aimed at a young British audience, reads in the main like a tract promoting migration. However, in one scene, fifteen-

year-old English migrant Gerry has unintentionally crashed a large caterpillar tractor. In the upshot 'a little man with a thin face like a jockey's' announces that:

'Any fool can stop an engine,' . . . 'Could have been a nasty accident. Still, what can you expect from a pommy?'

'It was my fault,' growled Stan. 'And I don't like the word "pommy". I thought it had disappeared from the language. Just remember my best friend is an Englishman.'

'I said pommy and mean pommy,' said the little man. 'You wouldn't catch any Australian kid doing his nut like that.'<sup>46</sup>

In the novel's preferred sensibility, the little man, who is confirmed to have been a jockey, is clearly out of order. Stan stands for the kind of welcome that British migrants should expect. The identification of the man as an ex-jockey, a profession with a tinge of disreputability about it, suggests an attempt to undermine the negative attitude to English migrants. Nevertheless the ex-jockey's attitude was common enough to require representation in the novel.

Thus, up until, and into, the era of multiculturalism as official government policy, British migrants were simultaneously denigrated and silenced. They were denigrated because Australians—that is, the so-called real Australians who mythically had British and Irish heritage—thought themselves to be better than them, and had evolved a better, if not more sophisticated, culture. They were silenced because it was expected, and needed both for the legitimisation of the origin myth and for the solidarity of British/Anglo-Saxon Australians, and Australian culture, over and against those who were more usually known as New Australians, the Greek, Italian, Latvian, Lebanese and other non-Anglo migrants.

One good popular cultural area to find this denigration and silencing expressed in everyday life is jokes. Thus, for example, jokes such as, 'Where does an Englishman hide his savings?—Under the soap in the shower', imply a lack of cleanliness in the English as compared to Australians and therefore a cultural inferiority.<sup>47</sup> Given what I have argued about the importance of the English language in Australia as a defining quality of Australianness, it should come as a surprise that there are also jokes dating, it would seem, from the 1950s which highlight the divergence between Australian English and English English. One of these, retold in Phillip Adams' *The Penguin Book of Australian Jokes*,



involves a simultaneous translation between Australian English and English English. Such jokes, told by Australians, use the differences between the two forms of English to highlight the cultural differences, and the inferiority, of the English.

Another set of jokes, typified in 'How do you know when a planeload of pommy migrants has landed?—The whine goes on after the engines have stopped', develops from, and reinforces, the characterisation of British, and especially English, migrants as whingers. Whinging is a form of complaining. Having come to a country where they expected to find a clone of Anglo-British culture only to be confronted with something quite different, it is not surprising that there were many complainers. However, by characterising such people derogatively as whingers, Australian culture attempted to silence them and reinforce the idea that Australian culture and British culture, Australians and British, were, at bottom, the same.

Even though British migrants were confronted every day with the differences of Australian culture from British culture, the strength of the ideology asserting their fundamental sameness often led to a refusal to accept that the cultures were different but, instead, to view Australian culture as just failing sometimes to come up to British standards. Pringle puts it like this:

'Much of the trouble, of course, is caused by the inability of the average British migrant to accept the fact that this is a different country, almost as strange and different as the United States or Italy, which should not be judged by English standards. For this reason the European migrant, knowing that everything will be strange and expecting nothing else, is often more successful in adapting himself.'<sup>48</sup>

British migrants found themselves identifying with, and immediately identified with, the core Australian culture, with 'real Australians', as opposed to the 'foreign', non-English-speaking, European and Levantine migrants.<sup>49</sup>

The extent to which there was an overlap between Australian and British cultures may well have made the experiences of the differences harder for British migrants expecting completely the same culture. This problem is reflected in the much higher return rates for British migrants as compared to other migrants. Appleyard writes that: 'Under the Assisted Passage Scheme, especially after the 1950s, rates of return by assisted migrants increased to about 15-20 per cent.'<sup>50</sup> Elsewhere he notes, 'in 1961 the rate was calculated at about 20 per cent compared with less than 10 per cent for other nationalities.'<sup>51</sup> The large amount of

assistance, which enabled many people to migrate who were not fully committed, is often cited as the reason why so many British migrants returned to Britain. However, high return rates have continued since the ending of the Scheme. In 1991-92, 14,465 British migrants came to Australia, and 4,820 migrants returned to Britain. In 1992-93, the figures were 9,484 and 4,130 respectively. These figures can be compared to the non-British migrant figures for the same years: 1991-92, 107,055 migrants came, 19,944 left; 1992-93, 75,946 came, 18,102 left.<sup>52</sup>

The ideological claim to the sameness of the two cultures was compounded by the political connections at the practical level of movement between the two countries. Until 1949 when the *Nationality and Citizenship Act* (1948) became law, all Australians were simply British citizens. Distinguishing British migrants from others, the act 'made British citizens eligible for Australian citizenship after only 12 months residence in Australia; non-Britons had to achieve five years residence before being eligible.'<sup>53</sup> After this act, which created the category of 'Australian citizen', Australian citizens remained British subjects having the right to enter and leave the United Kingdom at will. The Chifley Labor government introduced an Australian passport. However, eighteen months later the incoming Menzies government did away with this and Australians continued to travel on British passports until 1964. It was not until the Whitlam Labor government that a clear distinction was made between Australian and British citizens, that Australians were no longer British subjects.

While it was only symbolic, the proclamation of Advance Australia Fair as the Australian national anthem in April 1984, replacing God Save the Queen, which, however, remains as the Royal Anthem, marked another important step in the separation of Australia from Britain. In 1986 the Australia Acts were passed by both Britain and Australia. These formally severed many of the longstanding links with the British political and legal systems. They established that Britain could no longer legislate for any part of Australia, ended appeals from all Australian courts to the Privy Council, recognised that State Governors are not representatives of the British government and limited the role of the Queen in regard to States to the appointment and dismissal of State Governors. They also determined that British law no longer has an overriding effect on Australian law. Although not directly affecting the experience of migrants, these Acts fundamentally changed the status of Britain's relationship to Australia.

In this section I have wanted to outline the cultural features that led British migrants to Australia in the post-Second World War period to expect and assume that they held a special place in the social order of Australia. I have argued that, among these features, the claim that Australia was an Anglo-Saxon-settled country, with the racial privileges that those of Anglo-Saxon descent presumed were theirs by right, continued to have an effectivity after the use of the term 'Anglo-Saxon' faded into obscurity. I have also argued that, against all demonstrations of difference, both the British and the Australians were committed to the claim that British culture and Australian culture were fundamentally the same. Hence, British migrants were supposed to feel at home in Australia immediately. That they didn't was a ongoing challenge to the legitimacy of the ideology. These two imbricated and naturalised ideologies led to the differential status given to British migrants as compared to non-English speaking migrants. This differential status has been reproduced in the core/periphery structure of Australian official multiculturalism, a structure which privileges those identified as 'Anglo-Celtic' as being the 'real Australians.'

At the same time, other forces have been at work. Australia has moved away from Britain economically. It has also begun to express itself more, both institutionally and in national terms, as an independent country. These moves have had the side-effect of decreasing the rights of British migrants and of making them feel that they no longer have a political leverage in Australia, that, in fact, they no longer have a privileged status as compared to non-English speaking migrants. As we shall see, in the 1980s and 1990s this has led to a self-ethnicisation of the British in Australia in order to claim a new visibility and a new power, this time analogous to the visibility and power given to other, N.E.S.B. migrants. The effects of this change will be the topic of the next section.

## II

### **English Self-Ethnicisation in the Era of Multiculturalism**

#### **Prelude to Self-Ethnicisation**

It is not surprising, then, that, up until the 1980s and the Hawke Labor government, British migrants should have felt that, in some way, they were travelling to another part of the British Isles. However, from the period of Whitlam's government the rights of British migrants in Australia have been radically curtailed and brought into line with those of

migrants from other countries. For example, Bob Hawke's Labor government in 1984 rescinded the automatic right of British residents in Australia to vote in state and federal elections. However, this rescension only applied to Britons who became resident after this date. Thus, hundreds of thousands of British migrant residents in Australia who came before 1983 and who have not taken Australian citizenship, still have the right to vote in state and federal elections in Australia, as well as in Great Britain.

The anxiety over the gradual change in the political status of British migrants in Australia, a shift to place Britain and British migrants on a par with other migrants—the comparison here is with NESB migrants—is well brought out in an article from the United Kingdom's Settlers' Association magazine, *Endeavour*. This article, entitled 'British Australians now (officially) second-class citizens' discusses the High Court ruling of June 23rd, 1999, which disallowed the election of One Nation candidate, Heather Hill, to the federal Senate on the grounds that she had not renounced her British citizenship. She has Australian citizenship.

The article identifies the four judges who found against Hill and describes them as ruling 'that Britain is a "foreign power"'.<sup>54</sup> The article explains that:

'The High Court effectively ruled that Heather Hill could not assume her elected responsibilities because (a) she had not "renounced" her British citizenship, even though she was a naturalised Australian, and (b) Britain had been a "foreign power" since at least 1986, when the Australia Acts were passed.

At a single stroke the High Court ruling officially made second-class citizens of over a million British-born residents of Australia.'<sup>55</sup>

The point, here, is that Australian citizens who have retained their British citizenship are no longer eligible to stand for elected political positions in Australia. However, the article's real expression of shock is that Britain has been relegated in law to the status of all other countries as an effect of the Australia Acts. In practice, this means those countries from which come other, let us identify NESB, migrants.

The reason why the author considers the special, privileged circumstances of British migrants should continue is well brought out in the penultimate sentence:

'The irony, of course, is that migrants from some other groups who have had *nothing* to do with the development of Australia will be exempt from any such provisions [excluding them, the article itemises earlier, from the defence forces, the public service, the police, the education industry].'<sup>56</sup>

Why such migrants will be exempt is unclear. However, the animus of the sentence is more important. There is a rejection of the parity of British migrants with those from other countries on the grounds that the British should have a special status because of their historical importance in the formation of the Australian nation. There is also a fear that non-British migrants will, themselves, gain a special preferred status in Australia. It may be that there is a connection here with One Nation's fears about 'Asian' migration to Australia, especially as the person who originally objected to Heather Hill's election is described as: 'A Chinese migrant, Chuck Hong.'<sup>57</sup> At the least, Hong is, by implication, being grouped as an NESB migrant.

During the 1990s, British migrants' anxiety over the erosion of their rights was compounded by Paul Keating's attempt to resituate Australia as part of the South-East Asian region, his revision of the history of Britain's relationship with Australia, and his republicanism. As prime minister, Keating took the opportunity of a visit to Papua New Guinea to begin to supplement the Australian myth of Gallipoli which is British- and Euro-centred with a mythologising of Australian military gallantry on the Kokoda Trail, an Asianist myth. Around the same time, in the House of Representatives, Keating attacked the Liberals for having

'a cultural cringe to a country which decided not to defend the Malay peninsula, not to worry about Singapore, not to give us our troops back to keep ourselves free from Japanese domination.'<sup>58</sup>

Such statements were combined with the republican push to sever all remaining political ties with Britain. From the 1980s onwards there has also been a radical revision of settler Australia's own history, a recognition of the genocidal treatment of Aborigines, the destruction of the natural environment, and attacks on the consequences of the White Australia policy. All these have, at times, been laid at the door of the 'British' history of Australia—the historical narrative, established around the time of federation, that privileges British migration to Australia and understands Australian culture as derived from British/English culture.<sup>59</sup> In this way, the naturalisation of the claim that Australia has a

British history has come back to haunt both the population that identifies as Anglo-Celtic and the British migrants.

Taking all together, all these developments during the 1980s and 1990s produced an increasing sense of self-consciousness among British migrants of themselves as a community. Partington describes the situation when he writes that:

‘During the 1990s there has been a significant change. There is no desire among Australians born in England or of English descent to form a political party or a faction within the existing parties, but there is a growing resentment that influential parts of the media and many public figures denigrate the British contribution to Australian life.’<sup>60</sup>

The resentment described by Partington is exemplified in articles such as the one I have already discussed, ‘British Australians now (officially) second-class citizens.’ Other examples are easy to find. Also on the web, and from *Endeavour*, is a piece under the heading ‘Threats to Brits’ which describes the worry of the executive director of Ausflag, Harold Scruby, who, the article claims, wants to disenfranchise all people who hold British citizenship in any vote on changing the Australian flag because such people, he thinks, would be likely to vote against changes. The article ends saying:

‘Anglophobia is a medical condition in which someone suffers an irrational fear of the English. Harold Scruby appears to have a bad dose of it. It’s time he sought treatment.’<sup>61</sup>

### **Brit/Eng Ethnicisation as Practice**

The beginnings of the development of a sense of Brit/Eng ethnicity in Australia can be found in the second half of the 1980s. From this period on, there has been an increasing sense of ethnic self-consciousness among people who are either migrants from Britain or who identify Britishness in their backgrounds. Assertions of Britishness covers a range of practices from, for example, English-themed pubs to Partington’s book, published in 1994. Tom Stannage ran a course called *Ashes of Empire* from 1994 in the History Department at the University of Western Australia. While it was not itself an affirmation of Britishness it dealt with issues connected with Britishness. In a personal communication, Stannage tells me that he was more than a little surprised when he realised how many of the

students who enrolled for this course came from British backgrounds. Stannage's impression is that they took the course to get a better sense of their British heritage.

In her important new book, *Tracking the Jack*, Tara Brabazon has noted the way, as she put it, 'the Flag [the Union Jack] is *still* being followed in our purchases.'<sup>62</sup> I would qualify her '*still*' by suggesting that the Jack is being put to a new use today, at least by some people, promoting not so much Australia's Britishness but the ethnicity of a certain group within Australia. Among other examples, Brabazon goes on to identify a men's clothing shop in Perth's Carillion Arcade called 'UK Style' which inserts the flag between the two words of the name.

In what follows, much of the non-institutional aspects of Brit/Eng ethnicisation come from Western Australia and South Australia. There is a good reason for this. As I have noted (note 46), these states have the highest percentage of English born of British migrants and Perth and Adelaide have the highest density of English born of all the capital cities. Thus, there is a greater relative mass of people to share assertions of Englishness.<sup>63</sup>

As we shall see, foods have also played an important part in Brit/Eng ethnicisation, as they have for other ethnicised groups. I shall discuss this in more detail below but here, for dating purposes, I will give one example. Just outside Perth, in Rockingham, a suburb that has the highest density of UK born migrants in Australia at a little over 25% of the total population,<sup>64</sup> there is a confectionary shop called Sweet Memories, Candy Emporium. Opened in 1986, the shop has moved from selling mainly Australian sweets with a few imported English sweets for the migrants to specialising in English confectionary. It now sells, among other items, Bassett's and Maynard's sweets, Fox's mints and even imported Cadbury's sweets. According to the owner, the shop sells mainly to migrants but also to locals who want something a little different.

Sneja Gunew has described multiculturalism as being acceptable in Australia 'as a celebration of costumes, customs and cooking.'<sup>65</sup> Ethnic groups are defined by, and have presence in respect of, the dominant core culture. One, key element in such a spectacular form of ethnicisation is its imbrication with consumer society. Such ethnicisation is a form of ethnic production for consumption by others. For this reason, we can describe the aspects of multicultural ethnicisation that Gunew identifies in terms of commodification. The ethnicisation of N.E.S.B. groups is to a significant extent determined by the official organization of Australian society. Self-ethnicisation implies a different relation to the

dominant culture, a situation where the group is separating and distinguishing itself from the core. It is also the case that it is more difficult to make a claim to British ethnicity by way of the costume, custom and cooking of the English, in particular, as, as with the language, many of these are already lived, not as multicultural spectacle but as elements of the everyday life of the core, of 'mainstream' Anglo-Celtic Australia. Thus, as we shall see, a process of specialisation takes place which produces a distinction between the 'everyday' and the 'ethnic'.

The United Kingdom Settlers' Association (U.K.S.A.) was founded in 1967. A Melbourne-based organization, its original purpose was as a support group for British migrants. In its hey-day it had around 10,000 members—even at that number small compared to the number of British migrants who came to Australia in the decades after the Second World War. One of its most important offerings used to be a discount travel agency, suggesting its role as a service organization. By the early 1990s, however, the U.K.S.A.'s major role was the putting on of Old Tyme dances. In this we can see the U.K.S.A.'s on-going support function. That this has become the U.K.S.A.'s most important task suggests the aging of its membership and, correspondingly, the lack of interest of younger migrants in joining. It would seem that, with the increasing cosmopolitanism of Australians, and the increasing cultural diversity of Australia, there was a decreasing need for a support group in the traditional sense for British migrants.

By the early 1990s, I have been told, the U.K.S.A. was close to collapse. The advent of the policy of multiculturalism helped to change the needs of migrant groups. Where the purpose of the U.K.S.A. had been to support British migrants as they settled in their new country, the role of the N.E.S.B. migrant groups included acting as political interest groups on behalf of particular ethnic groupings, to promote to the rest of the Australian population the ethnic distinctiveness of the group, and to provide a space for group members to relax with people from similar cultural backgrounds. Because British migrants had been immediately accepted into Australian society, there had been no need for an advocacy group. A lack reinforced by the privileged political treatment that this group received. Since around 1996, I was told by Barrie Hunt, the elected president of the U.K.S.A., there has been an attempt to rebuild the organization on an ethnic basis. The time-lag between this ethnicising re-orientation of the U.K.S.A. and the much earlier construction of N.E.S.B. ethnic organizations reflects the very different situation of British migrants in Australia.



## **Soccer**

One place where the ethnicisation of the English, and their repositioning as an ethnic group among others, is most apparent is soccer. Unlike cricket, rugby league and rugby union, soccer was not successfully transplanted from England to Australia.<sup>66</sup> Its place as a winter sport being taken, depending on the State, by rugby league and Australian Rules football. Cricket became the national game in which colonial anxieties were acted out. Brought to Australia from England, it was in cricket that Australia's national identity could be proved by beating England. As Tara Brabazon puts it: 'Cricket performs the passions and hostilities of the colonial relationship between Australia and England in a way that soccer has not.'<sup>67</sup>

In Australia soccer was reimported by the non-British, European migrants of the post-war period. Wray Vamplew tells this history:

'Soccer clubs emerged out of the ethnic social clubs which developed from the geographical concentration of particular groups of migrants. Throughout Australian teams were founded with ethnic names and such clubs began to dominate the game, particularly after 1957 when the leading ones broke away from existing organizations to set up their own, culminating in the formal establishment of the Australian Soccer Federation in 1961 which took over administrative control of the sport in Australia.'<sup>68</sup>

As a consequence of its N.E.S.B. following, soccer got to be called 'wogball'.

The multicultural, that is ethnic, non-core, positioning of soccer in Australia means that, while '[i]t is the second most popular football code in every Australian state, yet at a time of changing attitudes towards immigration, it can easily be dismissed as un-Australian.'<sup>69</sup> Since at least the time of the Bicentennial Gold Cup of Soccer in 1988, there have been attempts to de-ethnicise soccer in Australia.<sup>70</sup> The common assumption is that such a move would increase interest in the game. Toby Miller quotes a statement made in 1989 by the company that had just been employed to promote the National Soccer League: 'The NSL must create a new image and change its name and logo so that it can be identified as Australian, modern-go-ahead and exciting ... Club names should be amended where necessary to prevent ethnic recognition.'<sup>71</sup> When David Hill was appointed head of the peak soccer body, '[h]is project for the 1996/97 season was to 'de-ethnicise' the game, to remove the intense loyalty from Greek, Croatian and Italian supporters.'<sup>72</sup> Hill had some

success in getting NSL clubs to drop ethnic markers from their names. Such a de-ethnicisation would bring wogball into the core of Australian culture and transform it into soccer.

Perth Glory gained entry into the national competition in 1996. It is, to all intents and purposes, an ethnic team. Even though its players come from a variety of backgrounds and its major owner, Nick Tana, is of Italian extraction, as Brabazon describes the supporters in 1997: 'The stands were filled with fans singing, drinking and *being English*.'<sup>73</sup> Perth Glory became an important public site for the large migrant English community in Perth. Many of these people play soccer, and the indoor variety, in local and in 'fun' leagues. Roy Jones and Philip Moore, who provide a history of soccer in Perth, discuss the origins of the teams in the ethnic social clubs. They go on to note that: 'Even when [the teams' names] would seem to indicate the lack of an ethnic association, such as the Kelmscott 'Roos, there is still an ethnicity attributed to the team by the other clubs and those that follow the league: Kelmscott is identified as being a team of 'Poms.'<sup>74</sup> In passing, it is worth commenting that the English ethnic team has no ethnic marker in its name. I have argued that Englishness is ambiguously positioned in Australia because of its association with the claimed British heritage of the 'Anglo-Celtic' culture. As Brabazon tells it: 'Not surprisingly, Hill has supported the Glory and their fans, working from the premise that Englishness is a safe or invisible ethnicity.'<sup>75</sup> Brabazon describes the expectation that English and Australian are so alike that an 'English' team is de facto a core Australian team. It is not. At this point, soccer is a marker of English ethnicity as opposed to Australian culture. It is a way of distinguishing the two. Perth Glory, and now in Sydney Northern Spirit, are not signs of the Australianisation of soccer but, rather, the ethnicisation of the English.

### ***English-themed Pubs***

Another sign of this ethnicisation has been the spread of English-themed pubs. Now, this is a complicated thing because, to some extent English-themed pubs are a part of the commodification of the English pub, a development which follows the commodification of the Irish pub as a more or less global phenomenon. In Australia there is a complex relationship between this development and the older Irish and English pubs which arose out of the needs of migrant communities in the era before multiculturalism. These existed, first and foremost, as places where members of those communities could go to relax and drink with other people from the same background. Indeed, they operated in a similar, but informal

way, to the ethnic clubs that have sprung up during official multiculturalism. Themed pubs are quite different. They self-consciously adopt what are thought to be key, recognisable characteristics of the Irish or English pub in order to produce an apparent simulacrum, an 'Irish' or 'English' ambience in which to drink imported beers which will be exotic and novel to non-Irish and non-English origin patrons, or nostalgic to Irish- and English-background drinkers. Such pubs offer a deliberately commodified ethnicity. In Australia, it seems that, while themed pubs may not be ethnically authentic like the earlier, working-class community pubs, they offer a simulation of authenticity located in nostalgia for an imagined past and/or an imagined homeland, combined with a middle-class consumer ambience. They are, nevertheless, authentic enough, especially because the beers sold are usually imported, to be patronised by Irish and English migrants. Their theming becomes a part of the spectacularisation that is a central aspect of commodified multicultural ethnicisation. Other Australians, including the so-called Anglo-Celtic Australians, go to these pubs to sample English, or Irish, ethnicity. As a part of this they may well be offered versions of English or Irish pub food, get to watch English Premier League soccer on giant television screens or listen to Irish folk-singing.

In Perth, the first Irish-themed pub was Fenians on Adelaide Terrace in the city.<sup>76</sup> It opened in 1987. Fenians can be contrasted to The Briar Patch, a working-class community Irish pub that existed since at least the 1970s on Albany Highway in Victoria Park.<sup>77</sup> In the 1990s, not suited to the middle-class needs of ethnic multiculturalism, The Briar Patch closed down and was entirely rebuilt as a bistro-style pub called SoHo's. The first English-themed pub, The Moon and Sixpence, listed in the telephone directory as The Moon and Sixpence British Pub, in Murray Street, was opened a couple of years after Fenians in 1989. It is claimed to be the first English-themed pub in Australia. There are now a number of such pubs in Melbourne such as the Charles Dickens and the Sherlock Holmes in Collins Street, and the Pint and Pickle in Frankston, an area with a high concentration of English migrants. The Pint and Pickle had been a wine bar but opened as an English-themed pub in 1990 picking up a clientele of English, Irish and Scottish migrants as well as other Australians. Similarly, on the edge of Sydney's Blacktown and Prospect, an area of concentrated English migrants, there is an English-themed pub called The Royal Cricketer's Arms.

## **Food**

For N.E.S.B. groups such as Italians, Greeks, Lebanese, Thais, Vietnamese, one of the most important sites for (re)producing and representing their ethnicity has been cuisine, and particularly restaurants. Ethnic restaurants serving 'non-Australian' cuisine simultaneously emphasise cultural difference and assert multicultural cultural diversity. While often catering to people for whom the cuisine served was their cuisine of origin these restaurants also seek a broader clientele, often by emphasising their ethnicity. Hage, for example, tells this story of a restaurant in Cabramatta:

'As one restaurant owner revealed through his son, who was interpreting, many of the restaurant owners know that the absence of signs in English is a good way to attract Anglo customers!'<sup>78</sup>

Here we have one example of how a restaurant can be commodified for non-ethnic consumption by emphasising its ethnicity.

Official multiculturalism, and its everyday cosmopolitan insistence on 'authenticity', has slowed down the creolisation of food, that is, among other things, the introduction of different ingredients to 'ethnic' dishes.<sup>79</sup> This was a characteristic of the era of assimilation when the concern was to make an 'exotic' dish acceptable to conservative Australian tastes. The Lebanese-Australian kebab is one example here. In the early 1980s I was offered a kebab in a take-away in Toowoomba which contained beetroot. A more subtle form of creolisation takes place when, for example, the traditional amount of hot spices in a dish will be lowered to make the food more acceptable to palates unused to such heat.

English food has different problems. First of all there is the received assumption that there is no English cuisine.<sup>80</sup> Second, many elements of English food, fish and chips for example, have been incorporated into day-to-day, core Australian cuisine.<sup>81</sup> Perhaps for these reasons Australia does not yet have ethnic English restaurants. This statement does require some qualification. In 1970 there opened in Cambridge Street, Wembley, Perth, a theatre restaurant called Dirty Dick's. Dirty Dick's was an institution in Perth until it closed in 1997.<sup>82</sup> The running of the operation was transferred to Sydney after Dirty Dick's opened there in 1972. Subsequently, theatre restaurants under the Dirty Dick's name were opened in Brisbane and Melbourne in 1975 and 1976. However, at the present time the only Dirty Dick's is in Sydney, though there is a touring company.<sup>83</sup> The story that goes with the restaurant is that the name 'Dirty Dick's' derives from an ale-house owner in London in the

mid-eighteenth century called Nathaniel Bentley. After his bride-to-be died he became a recluse earning the nickname Dirty Dick. Much later his old banqueting rooms were reopened under the name Dirty Dick's.

The form of Dirty Dick's is a scripted show, including music, that takes place while the customers are eating. At times members of the audience might be invited to participate in the shows. The shows themselves can vary historically from referencing King Arthur, Robin Hood, to Dick Turpin and can include jugglers and minstrels. The food, described as a banquet, is a three-course meal that includes such traditional English staples as roast beef and Yorkshire pudding, and plum pudding. It is served by women dressed as 'medieval wenches'. The whole entertainment is identified as 'medieval'. It is clear that in this context the term has a very loose meaning. What is implied is an English popular cultural understanding that refers to the relaxed, informal atmosphere and mountains of food at 'medieval banquets'. One reference point is the mythic knowledge of the banquets consumed by Henry VIII—who was, of course, also not medieval in the historical sense of the word but is identified as part of the pre-modern English identity.

Given what I have been arguing, it is not surprising to find that Dirty Dick's began in Perth. Its audience demographic, I am told, is roughly people in their thirties. These people are mostly 'Anglo-Celt' Australians and include numbers of English migrants. What Dirty Dick's does, is activate and commodify a sense of Englishness by drawing on a traditional national iconography, including food. It is 'safe' in that the elements of English identity that are utilised prefigure the modern, imperial England of colonialism and Queen Victoria.

Speaking more generally, English food has become a part of English ethnicisation. Hage quotes from the *Good Weekend* section of the *Sydney Morning Herald* in October, 1994:

'I knew the [culinary] revolution was complete when I was at the news agency the other day and noticed a booklet called *Step-by-Step English Cooking*. Part of the *Family Circle* series that includes such titles as *Step-by-Step Cajun Cooking* and *Step-by-Step Lebanese Cooking*, it contained recipes that generations of Australians learned at their mother's knee: shepherd's pie, roast beef with Yorkshire pudding, apple crumble, trifle, even scones and pikelets.

Once the staples of the nation, they're now just another variety of ethnic food.'<sup>84</sup>

Of course, it has been possible to get cookery books with these recipes for a hundred years. However, the *Family Circle* series places all the cuisines on an equal basis. The point here is more about the ethnicisation of English cuisine than the loss of a core Australian cuisine. The rhetoric used by the writer, 'they're now just another ...,' betrays an anxiety about the perceived changing status of English cuisine—and, by implication, the changed status of the English in Australia.

Since some time in the 1980s there has developed a range of gourmet versions of foods such as fish and chips. I remember, for example, in the mid-80s frequenting a gourmet fish and chip restaurant in Rosalie, Brisbane, called The Saucy Salmon. Such places are now a familiar sight. Similarly, since around the same time, there have developed specialist sausage shops catering to the gourmet market and selling a wide variety of types of sausages. In England, these foods were traditionally eaten by the working class. Now they, and others like them, are bought by the same core, 'Anglo-Celtic' Australian middle-class, who like to think of themselves as cosmopolitan, who are also the main frequenters of ethnic restaurants. These gourmet versions of 'ordinary' Australian foods form an ambivalent English ethnicisation located in spectacular consumption. In *Tracking the Jack*, Brabazon has demonstrated the commodification of this form of gourmet ethnicisation at a more reified level. Aristocrat Gourmet Foods, based in Perth, she writes, 'package their pastry products (using "traditional English recipes"), adorned with the Union Jack.'<sup>85</sup>

There are still many day-to-day English foods that cannot be found in Australia and the lack of which remind migrants that they are not 'home' here. Some of these foods are available at the BritFests, made especially as examples of English distinctiveness. In the November/December 1999 issue of *Endeavour* there is a letter about pork pies prompted by an article in the previous issue. Ed Thomas writes that:

'Since arriving in Melbourne in 1969 I have sought a true-tasting "English" pork pie. To me, an English pork pie tastes like the famous Walls pork pie from my home town, Acton in west London. . . .

I have eaten pies labelled "English pork pies" all over Melbourne and in Sydney, Adelaide and Cairns. But none had the distinctive, succulent flavour and consistency of the pork pies sold in the UK.'<sup>86</sup>

Thomas' letter exudes nostalgia for the pork pies of home, pork pies which may not even exist any more and which are, in any case, to some extent the product of memory. Hage describes positive nostalgia as:

'triggered by a positive presence which comes to fill a positively and only potentially existing lack. That is, the person does not necessarily go around feeling they lack something. It is the encounter with an object which creates both the yearning for the past homely experience associated with it, and in that very process the feeling that the object was lacking.'<sup>87</sup>

The editor recommends the pork pies sold at The Charles Dickens. Here the problem is not so much the lack of the food but its authenticity which is, in this instance, anchored in a nostalgia for the food of the homeland.

A rather different take on English, and other British, foods can be found in the way the major supermarket chains organize their displays. Coles tell me that they have no special section for foods from Britain. They have a policy of classifying all foods equally. The chain only has a section for 'Asian' food for those foodstuffs that don't fit the supermarket's established classification system—which is based on European-style foods. This, in itself, is an assertion of a core culture assumption. Most foods from Britain go onto the shelves along with all the other foods both locally made and imported. However, some imported British foodstuffs go into the gourmet section if the supplier or the supermarket's buyer thinks that they will sell better there. Woolworth's, which used to have an International Foods section around the early 1990s, is now developing an ethnic foods section the contents of which varies from store to store depending on the ethnic community which the store serves. Such a change suggests a move towards privileging the ethnic community rather than aiming to attract the cosmopolitan, core culture. While it is hard to confirm, it may well be that Woolworth's has recognised that its core clientele will either buy pre-packaged ethnic foods or go to ethnic restaurants rather than cooking such foods from scratch using appropriate ingredients. For Woolworth's, like Coles, most products from Britain go onto the shelves with all the other local and imported products. However, the chain has a tie-in with the Tesco's supermarket chain in Britain and, in areas where there are large numbers of British migrants, Tesco's brand name products are sold as speciality, ethnic items.<sup>88</sup> The identification of certain British foods, and British brands, as gourmet foods works in the same

way as the reconstitution of certain kinds of prepared foods, such as fish and chips, as gourmet items to sell as ethnic commodities.

### ***The BritFests***

One key characteristic of ethnic display in Australia is the ethnic festival where a wide variety of the ethnic group's costumes, customs and cuisine, as well as many ethnically identifiable products, are brought together. BritFest—the name is modelled on the German OktoberFest—started in Sydney in 1996. As its name implies, the organisers see it as a British festival rather than an English one, a festival which includes the ethnic cultures of Wales, Scotland and (Northern) Ireland, as well as England. The festival has been held at the Blacktown Show Ground. In 1998 it attracted around 15,000 visitors and in 1999 somewhat fewer at around 12,500 visitors. The logo for the festival has an image of the British Isles, including Ireland, within an outline of Australia. The flyer for BritFest '99 identifies offerings from pork pies, Scottish pies, Black pudding, Roast beef rolls, Devonshire teas, to Brass and pipe-bands, Newcastle Cambrian singers, Morris dancers, Irish dancers, to knights and maidens, Clan tents, Town Crier. Five Scottish clans were represented. Parramatta Power soccer club gave a demonstration. We have here cuisine, custom and costume that together establish the ethnic components of a general British ethnicity as much as any Italian or Greek festival their respective ethnicities. The recognition of a political dimension is demonstrated by the presence in the official guest list of, among others, the British Consul-General and the Federal Members for Greenway and Chifley. The Sydney BritFest is held on the first Sunday in November, as close as possible to that secular English festival, Guy Fawkes' night.

Taking the idea from Sydney, the U.K.S.A. have organised a BritFest in Melbourne since 1998. Organizing the BritFest is one example of how the U.K.S.A. is moving towards a promotion of British ethnicity. In this regard it is an important political success that the U.K.S.A. has gained regular funding of \$1000 a year from the Victorian Multicultural Association. The Melbourne BritFest is held in Frankston. In 2000 it had over forty stalls selling everything from fish and chips, and ploughman's lunches, to English china and Celtic jewellery, to British beers. There were also people dressed up as Beefeaters and as Queen Victoria. The U.K.S.A. hopes to have a significant British presence in Melbourne's 2001 Centenary parade to celebrate federation.



Such festivals as these assert a Brit/Eng ethnicity that employs components that date back to the time of the Empire. Interestingly, the rhetoric of Empire has become quite prominent, in Perth at least, over the last ten years or so, especially in the retail sector. Thus, for example, there is The Merchant Tea and Coffee Company, The Indiana Tea House, Cargo Furniture Company, and even Old Empire now renamed Empire Homewares. There is also an Early Settler Country Furniture Company and, while the name might to some extent be descriptive of what the company sells, it also utilises the nostalgic and Romantic connotations that 'settler' and 'country' have these days. Imagine if the firm had been called the Migrant Bush Furniture Company! All this suggests a conservative commodification of Empire nostalgia that represses the colonial power and economic relations that were involved in the actual Empire while asserting a Romantic view of the life of the settler and planter. What the origins of this nostalgia are is unclear. Nevertheless, it feeds into the development of Brit/Eng ethnicity in complicated ways. For example, it connects with Britain's/England's, own nostalgia for a time when it was the most powerful country in the world rather than a second-level country on the edge of Europe still attempting to decide whether to enter fully into the European Union with all that that implies, such as a common currency. At the same time, there may well be a subterranean connection to a certain nostalgia at the loss of Anglo-colonial power—or at least a sense of entitlement—within Australia.<sup>89</sup>

The Brit/Eng ethnicity being produced at BritFests does not include the effects of the post-Second World War West Indian and South Asian migrations to Britain.<sup>90</sup> It is a white, monarchist ethnicity from the time when Britain ruled a large Empire—including Australia. Note, for example, the Melbourne BritFest's use of an impersonation of Queen Victoria, which may well not be an expression of ethnicity at all in the sense that the term has gained in Australia. Italian festivals don't have somebody dressing up as King Vittorio Emanuele II. It is easy for an ethnicisation with markers such as Queen Victoria and Beefeaters, to blur into an Anglo-Saxon nationalism. While not the intention of the organisers of the BritFests, such Brit/Eng ethnic nostalgia can become a glorification of the claimed British heritage of Australia, and of the 'Anglo-Celtic' core over the multicultural periphery.

At the beginning of this article I discussed how Australian multiculturalism functions according to a core and periphery structure. In this system N.E.S.B. people are

peripheralised as ethnics while English speakers are expected to (be) merge(d) into the English-speaking-background 'Anglo-Celtic' core. During the era of assimilation migrants from Britain were privileged in Australia in a number of ways. The loss of those privileges is not directly traceable to the adoption of multiculturalism as official policy. Rather, it has to do with the long-term assertion of the independence of Australia as a national entity in its own right, and one positioned in the South-East Asian region. However, the loss of these privileges has come at the same time that official multiculturalism has given a different sort of power to other, N.E.S.B. migrants. Within this context it is not surprising that migrants from Britain should see their self-ethnicisation as a route to both cultural recognition within Australia and a new form of power, albeit a form of power that puts them on a par with N.E.S.B. migrants.

The ethnicisation of the British migrants begins a deconstruction of the core/periphery system of official multiculturalism by differentiating between the core 'Australians,' the so-called Anglo-Celts, and those people who self-consciously claim, or reclaim, a British ethnicity. One naturalised assumption of the core/periphery structure is that those defined as 'Anglo-Celtic' are somehow less migrants than other Australians.<sup>91</sup> This distinction, not unique in structure to Australia, is often thought of in terms of a differentiation between migrants and settlers.<sup>92</sup> Absorbing British migrants directly into Australian culture, and, since the advent of multiculturalism, into the 'Anglo-Celtic' core, helped to preserve the ideologically naturalised status of the members of this group as non-migrant Australians—and, therefore, as more authentically Australian. Further, the self-ethnicisation of the British upsets the claim to a homogeneous 'Australian' culture that is set against the variety of migrant, ethnic cultures. It opens the way for a greater ethnicisation of other northern European groups who have migrated here, and who have historically been absorbed into the core, such as the Germans and the Dutch to assert more strongly their migrant ethnicities, and for those whose ancestors were absorbed into the core to find their ethnic origins. With this process begins a dismantling of the distinction between core and periphery.

I would like to thank Barrie Hunt, of the U.K.S.A., and Steve Saunders, co-founder and co-organiser of the Sydney BritFest, and also Simon Mumby of Dirty Dick's theatre restaurant, for the information, and written material, that they gave me during my research for this article.

I would also like to thank Philip Moore, Tom Stannage and Felicity Newman for their comments on an earlier version of this article.

- 
- 1 John Docker 'Postnationalism,' *Arena Magazine*, Feb-March, 1994, p41.
  - 2 On the ideology of assimilation see Zygmunt Bauman *Modernity and Ambivalence* Cambridge, Polity Press 1991. For the traditional, sociological account of assimilation see Milton Gordon *Assimilation in American Life* New York, Oxford University Press 1964.
  - 3 In Reginald Appleyard with Alison Ray and Alan Segal *The Ten Pound Immigrants* London, Boxtree 1988, Appleyard quotes Leslie Hayden, the Opposition immigration spokesman at the 1954 Citizenship Convention. Hayden 'declared that British migrants were the 'best migrants', with no assimilation problems. [This was] [b]ecause a Briton merely 'came to this part of the Commonwealth from another part'' (p. 97).
  - 4 See, for example, Sneja Gunew *Framing Marginality: Multicultural Literary Studies* Melbourne, Melbourne University Press 1994; Adam Jamrozick, Cathy Boland, Robert Urquhart *Social Change and Cultural Transformation in Australia* Melbourne, Cambridge University Press 1995.
  - 5 See Jon Stratton *Race Daze* Sydney, Pluto Australia 1998, *passim*.
  - 6 The pamphlet provides this definition: 'English Speaking Born are those persons born overseas in countries where English is the main language spoken.'
  - 7 Stratton *Race Daze* pp. 43-44.
  - 8 A useful book on the cultural construction of a British identity is Mike Storry and Peter Childs ed. *British Cultural Identities* London, Routledge 1997. The Introduction is particularly relevant to the argument that I am developing here.
  - 9 Geoffrey Partington *The Australian Nation: Its British and Irish Roots* Melbourne, Australian Scholarly Publishing 1994, p. ix.
  - 10 Partington *The Australian Nation*, p. ix.
  - 11 The Australian film 'The Craic' (1999), a vehicle for the Irish-Australian comedian Jimeoin, could be thought of in terms of the production of a (Northern) Irish ethnicity. The film chronicles the adventures of two Northern Irishmen who are hunted by the Immigration Department for working while having tourist visas. One of them wants to stay in Australia, the other wants to go back to Ireland. The film is set in 1988.
  - 12 'BritFest 2000' at [wysiwy//16/http/www.geocities.com/Athens/Acropolis/1850/brit2000.html](http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Acropolis/1850/brit2000.html)
  - 13 Quoted here from Peter Cochrane 'Anglo-Saxonness: Ancestors and Identity' *Communal/Plural*, no 4, 1994,' p. 9.
  - 14 Douglas Cole 'The Crimson Thread of Kinship': Ethnic Ideas in Australia, 1870-1914' *Historical Studies*, vol. 14, no 56, p. 521.
  - 15 In 'Britishness in Australia,' *Voices*, 1996, vol 1, no 3, Peter Cochrane writes that, 'British sentiment enjoyed a formidable ascendancy in Australia for nearly two centuries' (p. 63).

- 16 Barry York *Studies in Australian Ethnic History: Racial characteristics of the Australian people: Commonwealth censuses 1911-1966* Canberra: Centre for Immigration and Multicultural Studies, Research School of Social Sciences 1996, p. 7.
- 17 Christopher Hill 'The Norman Yoke' in *Puritanism and Revolution: Studies in Interpretation of the English Revolution of the 17th Century* London, Secker & Warburg 1958, p. 57.
- 18 Hill 'The Norman Yoke', p. 115.
- 19 J. R. Hall 'Mid-Nineteenth-Century American Anglo-Saxonism: The Question of Language' in Allen J. Frantzen and John D. Niles *Anglo-Saxonism and the Construction of Social Identity* Gainesville, University Press of Florida 1997, p. 134. The best discussion of Anglo-Saxonism in the United States is Reginald Horsman *Race and Manifest Destiny: The Origins of American Racial Anglo-Saxonism* Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press 1981.
- 20 Cochrane 'Anglo-Saxonness', p. 8.
- 21 Cochrane 'Anglo-Saxonness' p. 10.
- 22 Perhaps the last mainstream use of the term was in William Bostock's book *Alternatives of Ethnicity: Immigrants and Aborigines in Anglo-Saxon Australia*, Hobart, Cat and Fiddle Press. It was published in 1977.
- 23 Geoffrey Partington 'The English in Australia', *The Adelaide Review*, April 1999, p. 16.
- 24 Partington 'The English in Australia', p. 16.
- 25 <http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Acropolis/1850/index.html>
- 26 Cole 'The Crimson Thread of Kinship', p. 513.
- 27 <http://www.adelaide.net.au/~national/na02.html>
- 28 <http://www.adelaide.net.au/~national/na02.html>
- 29 Quoted in Michael Roe *Australia, Britain, and Migration 1915-1940: A Study of Desperate Hopes* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press 1995, p. 200.
- 30 John Douglas Pringle *Australian Accent* London, Chatto and Windus 1959, p. 11.
- 31 In *The Ten Pound Immigrants*, Appleyard writes that, 'the Appleyard survey [reported in Reginald Appleyard *British Emigration to Australia* London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson 1964] confirmed that many British assisted migrants truly believed that they *were* going to a Britain of the South Seas, a land of perpetual sunshine where they would earn much higher wages than they could ever earn in Britain, where class would not be an impediment to achievement for either them or their children, where there would be no language problem and where the people were British in allegiance and friendly towards British migrants' (p. 80).
- 32 For an account of the Assisted Passage Scheme see Appleyard *The Ten Pound Immigrants*. Appleyard writes that: 'In 1981, following a major review of the Assisted Passage Scheme, the Liberal government decided that under the prevailing economic circumstances assisted passages were no longer needed to attract to

- 
- Australia the 'desired size and type of intake' (p.43). In 1954 assisted passage schemes were also introduced for suitable migrants from the United States, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland.
- 33 This figure comes from Appleyard *The Ten Pound Immigrants*, p. 160. While Appleyard has the better discussion, further information on the scheme, and some oral history of migrants' experiences of using it, can be found in Betka Zamoyska *The Ten Pound Fare: Experiences of British People who emigrated to Australia in the 1950s* London, Viking 1988.
- 34 Appleyard *The Ten Pound Immigrants*, p. 160.
- 35 Zamoyska *The Ten Pound Fare*, p. 64.
- 36 Zamoyska *The Ten Pound Fare*, p. 66.
- 37 Quoted in Appleyard *The Ten Pound Immigrants*, p. 28.
- 38 Partington *The Australian Nation*, p. x.
- 39 Geoffrey Dutton 'British Subject' *Nation*, 6 April, 1963, p. 16.
- 40 Quoted in Malcolm Turnbull *The Reluctant Republic* Port Melbourne, William Heinemann 1993, p. 61.
- 41 Ghassan Hage 'Anglo-Celts Today: Cosmo-Multiculturalism and the Phase of the Fading Phallus' in *Communal/Plural* 4, 1994, pp. 54-55.
- 42 Hage 'Anglo-Celtics Today', p. 55.
- 43 quoted in Zamoyska *The Ten Pound Fare*, p. 15.
- 44 Quoted in Zamoyska *The Ten Pound Fare*, p. 15.
- 45 For a discussion of the origins of pommy see W. S. Ransom *Australian English: An Historical Study of the Vocabulary 1788-1898* Canberra, Australian National University Press 1966, pp. 62-63. Ransom tells us that the word 'is first recorded in Australian English during World War 1, when it gives every appearance of being generally established.' While its origin is obscure, as Ransom goes on to write: 'It is generally derogatory in its connotations.' By the 1950s it was being applied particularly to English migrants but more generally to all migrants from Britain except the Northern Irish.
- 46 Allan Aldous *The New Australians* London, The Bodley Head 1956, p. 70. On attitudes to English migrants in children's literature see Sharyn Pearce 'When Australia Calls: The English Immigrants in Australian Children's Literature' in *Papers: Explorations into Children's Literature*, vol 9, no 2, 1999, pp. 3-12.
- 47 Some anti-English jokes can be found in Phillip Adams and Patrice Newell *The Penguin Book of Australian Jokes* Ringwood, Vic, Penguin 1994 and Phillip Adams and Patrice Newell *The Penguin Book of More Australian Jokes* Ringwood, Vic., Penguin 1996.
- 48 Pringle *Australian Accent*, p. 22.
- 49 According to the 1991 census, 81% of the United Kingdom born population in Australia came from England, 14% from Scotland, and 2.5% from Wales. The States with the highest percentage of English born are Western Australia and South

Australia both with 83%. Perth has the highest concentration of UK born in its population at 15.2% of the total population followed by Adelaide with 11.6%. British migrants tend to stick together rather than blend into the general population, possibly for the reasons that I have been outlining. Thus, there are twenty suburbs around Australia, all except three, which are in Victoria, in Western Australia and South Australia, which have populations of British born at, or exceeding 10% of the total population of the suburb. Four suburbs, Rockingham and Armadale in WA and Elizabeth and Munno Parra in SA, have populations of British born exceeding 20% of the total population. These figures come from *Community Profiles 1991 Census: United Kingdom Born: Bureau of Immigration and Population Research* Canberra: Australian Govt. Pub. Service, 1994.

- 50 Appleyard *The Ten Pound Immigrants*, p. 151.
- 51 Appleyard *The Ten Pound Immigrants*, p. 39.
- 52 These figures come from *Community Profiles, 1991 Census, United Kingdom Born*.
- 53 Appleyard *The Ten Pound Immigrants*, p. 39. Appleyard goes on to note that 'Britons also received better assisted-passage conditions, were provided with hostel accommodation during initial resettlement, could move in and out of Australia on visits with no difficulty, received preferential treatment when seeking to enter the Australian military forces, and could vote in elections without becoming Australian citizens.'
- 54 'British Australians now (officially) second-class citizens' at [wysiwyg/11/http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Acropolis/1850/citizens.html](http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Acropolis/1850/citizens.html)
- 55 'British Australians now (officially) second-class citizens'
- 56 'British Australians now (officially) second-class citizens'
- 57 'British Australians now (officially) second-class citizens'
- 58 Quoted from Partington *The Australian Nation*, p. xv.
- 59 Richard White in *Inventing Australia* Sydney, Allen & Unwin 1981, writes that: 'The question of Australian identity has usually been seen as a tug-of-war between Australianness and Britishness, between the impulse to be distinctively Australian and the lingering sense of a British heritage. However this attitude to the development of an Australian identity only became common towards the end of the nineteenth century, when self-conscious nationalists began to exaggerate what was distinctive about Australia.' (p. 47.)
- 60 Partington 'The English in Australia'
- 61 'Threats to Brits' at <http://www.geocities.com/Athens/Acropolis/1850/threats.html>
- 62 Tara Brabazon *Tracking the Jack: A Retracing of the Antipodes* Sydney, University of New South Wales Press 2000, chap 1. I am grateful to Tara for allowing me to read a copy of this book while it was in press. This article would have been much enriched had I had the pleasure of reading *Tracking the Jack* before writing it.
- 63 In *The Lads in Action: Social Process in an Urban Youth Subculture* Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing 1994, David Moore discusses how, in the 1990s, the English working class youth cultural style of 'skinheads' came to be utilised in Perth as a

- 
- marker of English ethnicity: 'Most Perth skinheads are English-born, having arrived in Perth in their early or pre-teenage years. Theirs is a youthful adaptation to the question of ethnic identity and there are other ways of expressing ethnicity which are more suitable to older British and Irish migrants such as membership of ethnic clubs (e.g. the Irish Club) or sporting organizations (particularly those focused on football [soccer])' (p. 12.)
- 64 *Community Profiles, 1991 Census; United Kingdom Born*, p. 10.
- 65 Gunew *Framing Marginality*, p.
- 66 As Wray Vamplew in "'Wogball": Ethnicity and Violence in Australian Soccer' in Richard Guilianotti and John Williams eds. *Game Without Frontiers: Football, Identity, Modernity* Aldershot, Ashgate Publishing 1994, notes, 'Although not an exclusive explanation, one reason is that both Australian rules and rugby union (from which rugby league emerged in 1908) established themselves before soccer.' (p. 219, note 5.)
- 67 Tara Brabazon 'What's the Story Morning Glory? Perth Glory and the Imagining of Englishness', *Sporting Traditions*, vol 14, no 2, 1998, p. 53. An amplified version of this article forms Chapter 6 of Brabazon's *Tracking the Jack*.
- 68 Wray Vamplew "'Wogball'", p. 209.
- 69 Brabazon 'What's the Story Morning Glory?', p. 55.
- 70 See Toby Miller 'The unmarking of soccer: making a brand new subject' in Tony Bennett, Pat Buckridge, David Carter, Colin Mercer eds. *Celebrating the Nation: A Critical study of Australia's Bicentenary* Sydney, Allen & Unwin 1992.
- 71 Miller 'The unmarking of soccer,' p. 109.
- 72 Brabazon 'What's the Story Morning Glory?', p. 54.
- 73 Brabazon 'What's the Story Morning Glory?', p. 53. Brabazon's italics. It should be added that the Glory have a very large number of fans who are not of English background—and that many of these also sing at Glory games.
- 74 Roy Jones and Philip Moore "'He only Has Eyes for Poms': Soccer, Ethnicity and Locality in Perth, WA' in *Ethnicity and Soccer in Australia*, Australian Society for Sports History Sydney, University of Western Sydney 1994, p. 23.
- 75 Brabazon 'What's the Story Morning Glory?' p. 55.
- 76 The commodification of Irish culture and its connection to the production of an Irish ethnicity is very much worthy of discussion and connects closely with the similar production of English ethnicity. In an article entitled 'Con Eire' in *The Face* (vol 3, no 37, 2000, pp. 126-127), Kevin Maher argues that this commodification started with Michael Flatley and his spectacular step-dancing production, *The Riverdance*. Maher centres his discussion on the use of Flatley's team at the 1994 Eurovision Song Contest which was held in Dublin. Maher describes how, six years later at the time that he was writing the article, 'the label of simplistic, easy-access 'Irishness' is ubiquitous. Like the best marketing scams, 'Ireland' is a name that sells a non-existent product. It's an ambiguous concept that hints at misty-eyed nostalgia, wholesome traditional family values and charming feel-good sincerity' (p. 120). Importantly, from the point of view of the construction of a multicultural,

- 
- commodified ethnicity, a letter (*The Face*, vol 3, no 39, 2000, p. 32) commenting favourably on this piece notes that Flatley is from Chicago, not Ireland. Sarah Manvel notes that: 'What [Flatley] has tapped into, and what the 'Celtic Tiger' has gotten rich selling, is Ireland for Irish-Americans.' Manvel goes on to write: 'Do you really think most Americans want to see the reality of Dublin or Belfast? Of course not. We want the *nostalgie de la boue*, and will spend lots of money to get it.' Manvel's point is as applicable to the Irish in Australia where Flatley's creations, along with Irish-themed pubs, have helped establish a new, if you like postmodern, multicultural sense of Irish ethnic identity.
- 77 This distinction between pubs, and restaurants, opened to serve the community and those opened to serve both the community and the core Australian population operates among other ethnic groups as well. Perhaps the best example is the legendary 'No Name' Italian restaurant—usually known as 'No Name's'—in Sydney which has successfully made the leap from community restaurant to multicultural cult icon.
- 78 Ghassan Hage 'At Home in the Entrails of the West' in Helen Grace, Ghassan Hage, Lesley Johnson, Julie Langsworth, Michael Symonds *Home/World: Space, Community and Marginality in Sydney's West* Sydney, Pluto Australia 1997, p. 144.
- 79 This development needs to be distinguished from the development of a Pacific Rim fusion cuisine which, while now available in numbers of bistro bars, has a heritage in the *haute cuisine* experiments of Australian chefs.
- 80 For one discussion of the differences in form of the cuisines in France and England, in particular the emphasis on a vernacular cuisine rather than *haute cuisine* in England, see Stephen Mennell *All Manners of Food: Eating and Taste in England and France from the Middle Ages to the Present*, esp Chap 5.
- 81 The history of fish and chips as an English food is itself worth comment. Far from being quintessentially English from time immemorial, it has only existed since the late nineteenth century. Moreover, its evolution appears to be connected with the movement of Jewish migrants into the East End of London during that period. These Ashkenazi Jews ate a lot of fried fish. Thus, fish and chips has a working class and, at least to some extent, migrant origin. (The best history of fish and chips is John K. Walton *Fish and Chips and the English Working Class, 1870-1940* Leicester, Leicester University Press 1992.) Perhaps, then, it is not so surprising that one of the early creolised foods to come out of the South Asian migration to Britain in the 1960s and 1970s was chips with curry sauce, often served in fish and chip shops in those English cities that had large South Asian populations.
- 82 I am told that some of the students studying theatre arts at Curtin supported themselves at university by working there.
- 83 There is a theatre restaurant in Melbourne called Dirty Dick's Medieval Madness but this is under different ownership.
- 84 Quoted in Hage 'At Home in the Entrails of the West,' p. 122.
- 85 Tara Brabazon *Tracking the Jack*, Chap 1..
- 86 'In Search of an English pork pie', *Endeavour*, November/December, 1999, p. 2.
- 87 Hage 'In the Entrails of the West', p. 106.



- 88     There is a certain humour here as Tesco's branded goods are sold cheaper than other brands in England because they are the chain's own brand.
- 89     Cochrane in 'Britishness in Australia' describes the emergence of those he calls British Australians as a self-conscious group in the second half of the nineteenth century. He argues that their slow demise began after the Second World War. He writes that '[t]heir ideal England was strong, tolerant and just, the centre of a great, powerful and harmonious Empire' (p. 71).
- 90     To be fair, I was told that Sydney might well have a stall selling curries at the 2001 BritFest. In England, in the mid-90s, the result of a now legendary survey showed that English people in general are now more likely to have curry for Sunday lunch than the previously traditional roast beef and roast potatoes.
- 91     I am not including Aborigines in this dichotomy.
- 92     I discuss this distinction in more detail in 'Making Social Space for Jews in America' in my *Coming Out Jewish: Constructing Ambivalent Identities* London, Routledge 2000, pp. 257-258.